

identifying multiple markup elements from a schema of a markup based document;
mapping the multiple markup elements into a same database table-column pair;
associating a rowset and a database table with each of the multiple markup elements;
creating a mapping document based on the schema of the markup based document, the mapping document comprising rowset-specific mapping annotations defining a mapping of the multiple markup elements into at least one column of the rowsets; and
decomposing contents of the multiple markup elements from the markup based document into the at least one column of the rowsets based on the rowset-specific mapping annotations.

[005] Claim 13 has been similarly amended. Claim 13 has also been amended to include the limitation "associating a first rowset and a database table with a first markup element from the multiple markup elements, and associating a second rowset and the database table with a second markup element from the multiple markup elements." A further amendment has been made to Claim 13, including the limitations "automatically identifying" and "each of the multiple markup elements having a substantially similar markup identifier." Claims 2-4 and 14-16 have also been amended to reflect the amendments to Claims 1 and 13.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

[006] Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. As Applicants discussed with the Examiner in the telephone interview, the indefinite term "items" of independent Claims 1 and 13 has been amended to "markup elements." In the telephone interview, applicants and the Examiner agreed that this amendment is sufficiently definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Not OK.
Jm.
05/15/08

COMMON INVENTORSHIP

[007] Applicants note that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time the invention was made and that the joint inventors were under an obligation

Interview Summary:

A telephone interview was held on February 19, 2008. Attendees included David J. McKenzie (Applicants' Representative, Reg. No. 46,919), Scott C. Hilton (Applicants' Representative), Dennis Y. Myint (Examiner), and Cam Y. Truong (Examiner).

A proposed amendment to Claim 1 was discussed, and the Examiner agreed that Claim 1, as amended, was sufficiently definite to overcome the rejection for indefiniteness under § 112. Certain novel aspects of the invention were discussed in view of the proposed amendment to Claim 1. The Examiners agreed that Claim 1, as amended, was likely patentable over the asserted art, but that an additional search would be performed upon submittal of a request for continued examination. Applicants agreed to file a request for continued examination. The Examiner also agreed to provide Applicants with the Varlarmis reference (Varlarmis, I., and Vazirgiannis, M., "Bridging XML-Schema and Relational Databases. A System for Generating and Manipulating Relational Databases Using Valid XML Documents," November 9-10, 2001.) Applicants promptly received the Varlarmis reference by fax.

Not OK.
ym.
05/15/2008